UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/542,212	07/14/2005 Dieter Gansert		SUS-108/500711.20008	1749
	7590 03/25/201 AWRENCE & HAUG	l	EXAMINER	
745 FIFTH AV	ENUE- 10TH FL.	SCHATZ, CHRISTOPHER T		
NEW YORK, N	N1 10131		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1791	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/25/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/542,212	GANSERT, DIETER		
Examiner	Art Unit		
CHRISTOPHER SCHATZ	1791		

	CHRISTOPHER SCHATZ	1791					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>09 March 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appel for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v	i, or other evidence, www. with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may require any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
NOTICE OF APPEAL  2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with the statement of the sta	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) They are not deemed to place the application in beta appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the proposed and the prop	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); ter form for appeal by materially red	E below); lucing or simplifying tl					
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 41-50. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 26-40.		be entered and an ex	xplanation of				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>							
7. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).							
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.  REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  See Continuation Sheet.							
12.	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Richard Crispino/	/CHRISTOPHER SCH	ATZ/					
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1791	Examiner, Art Unit 1791						

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments to claims 44-46 change the scope of the claims and thus require further consideration by the examiner.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: With respect to applicant's arguments directed at Neubauer, said arguments amount to individual attacks on the reference without considering Honegger in combination with Neubauer. Applicant is reminded that one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually and in a vacuum of each other as a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is a consideration relating to the combined teachings of the references (and not each reference in a vacuum of the others).

As to Section III of the Remarks, it is noted that the Final Rejection dated 12/09/2009 does not make a rejection under 35 U.S.C 102(b). Applicant's arguments directed toward Flora are also individual attacks on the reference without considering Flora in combination with Neubauer and Gerhard.